

RESNICK & LOUIS, P.C.
TROY A. CLARK, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 11361
MATTHEW B. BECKSTEAD, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 14168
8925 West Russell Road, Suite 220.
Las Vegas, NV 89148
tclark@rlattorneys.com
mbeckstead@rlattorneys.com
Telephone: (702) 997-3800
Facsimile: (702) 997-3800
Attorneys for Defendants
Walmart, Inc. d/b/a Walmart Supercenter
#3351 & Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MICHELLE C. ZEITER, individually, and as
Special Administrator for ESTATE OF
MICHAEL BUCHNA; JENNIFER C. BEAM,
individually, and as Special Administrator for
ESTATE OF MICHAEL S. BUCHNA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WALMART INC., a foreign corporation d/b/a
WALMART SUPERCENTER #3351; and
WAL-MART STORES, INC., a foreign
corporation; and DOES I through X; inclusive;
and ROE CORPORATIONS I through V,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:21-cv-00061-RFB-DJA

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND DEADLINES TO FILE AND
SERVE RESPONSES PERTAINING TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STRIKE
DEFENDANTS' ANSWER [ECF NO. 40]**

(First Request)

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Plaintiffs MICHELLE C. ZEITER,
Individually and as Special Administrator for ESTATE OF MICHAEL BUCHNA and
JENNIFER C. BEAM, Individually and as Special Administrator for ESTATE OF MICHAEL
S. BUCHNA (collectively "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys of record SIMON LAW
and BROCK H. OHLSON PLLC, and Defendants WALMART, INC. and WAL-MART

1 STORES, INC. (collectively “Defendants”), by and through their attorneys of record, RESNICK
2 & LOUIS, P.C., (foregoing parties are collectively referred to hereinbelow as “Parties”) to the
3 extend the remaining response deadlines pertaining to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Defendants’
4 Answer [ECF No. 40] that was filed on April 7, 2022, pursuant to LR IA 6-1. This is the first
5 stipulation for extension of the deadlines for Defendants’ opposition and Plaintiffs’ reply
6 pertaining to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Defendants’ Answer [ECF No. 40].

7 **REASONS FOR REQUESTING AN EXTENSION OF DEADLINES**

8 The Parties aver that good cause exists to extend the existing deadlines for Defendants’
9 opposition and Plaintiffs’ reply by 4 days. Defendants’ counsel, Troy A. Clark, Esq., is on a
10 previously scheduled vacation with his family and will be out of the office until Thursday, April
11 21, 2022. Accordingly, the parties have agreed to extend their respective response deadlines four
12 days, as set forth hereinbelow:

13 ///

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 3